

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

VOL. X, No. 20

NOVEMBER 27, 1950

\$2.00 per year; 10 cents per copy

Revolution in Race Relations

A TREMENDOUS amount of change in race relations has taken place in the United States in the last five years. A revolution has been sweeping the country; it has been a non-violent revolution, but its effects have been as drastic and are undoubtedly more stable than if bloodshed had accompanied it.

Some of the changes are significant symbolically. Negro baseball players have been admitted into the big leagues and Jackie Robinson has become a hero for the sand-lot gangs. While not significant quantitatively for employment of Negroes, this is a very important development psychologically. Prejudice against immigrants was largely broken down in this country when football and baseball players with unpronounceable names became heroes to the kids.

Many other changes have taken place. A Negro, Dr. Ralph Bunche, has achieved one of the highest posts in international affairs, and has recently been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. A fraternity at Amherst College defied its national organization by admitting a Negro boy to membership. The President of the United States has ordered the elimination of segregation in the Armed Services. Lynching has nearly disappeared and anti-Semitism, while still in existence, appears to be declining.

The Supreme Court has probably had more effect than any other agency in the advancement of rights for minorities. Recent decisions have required that Negro teachers receive equal pay for equal work, that the right to vote in primaries shall not be restricted on racial grounds, that restrictive covenants in housing shall not be enforceable in Federal courts, that the respective states must furnish equal opportunity for education to all students regardless of race, and that railroads engaged in interstate commerce must provide equal facilities, including dining car service, to all passengers having the same kind of ticket.

The Supreme Court has not yet ruled on the legality of segregation as such. But a number of its decisions have actually forbidden segregation in particular matters. For example, its decision on the

admission of Negro students to state universities has actually breached the wall of segregation in that field, and seven of the state universities in the South are now admitting Negro students. Efforts to build duplicate facilities of equal merit for Negro students become unbearably expensive, and the Supreme Court has clearly indicated that half-measures will not do.

Further, a Supreme Court decision in June indicated that *equal* opportunities for education are not enough, but that, in effect, the opportunities for education must be *the same* opportunities as those afforded to white students, rather than being merely equivalent. Even if a Negro student studied in a building just as good, and had access to a library just as adequate, and had equally good teachers, but was still restricted to classes composed entirely of Negroes, he would not be getting an equal opportunity for advancement in our society, because he would still be a member of a segregated group. The logic of the situation is that a segregated opportunity cannot be really an equal opportunity.

Great changes have occurred also in economic opportunities for minority groups. Traditionally, Negroes have been confined largely to domestic service and to agriculture; when they entered industry at all, it was generally at the level of unskilled employment, and opportunities for training and advancement were very poor. But during the Second World War, an unprecedented number of Negro workers were admitted to the factories. More than half a dozen states have established fair employment practice commissions to see to it that members of minority groups are treated fairly as to wages, promotions, and the like. Not all of the inequities have been abolished, by any means, but vast progress has been made.

In the past, Negroes have been largely excluded from white collar jobs that would bring them into direct contact with the general public—such jobs as clerks in department stores, secretaries in offices, and the like. In many parts of the country, Negroes and members of other minority groups have been

admitted to such jobs recently. The riots and boycotts that had been predicted have failed to materialize, and most members of the public appear hardly to notice, and certainly not to care about, the skin color of the person waiting on them.

The CIO has been officially opposed to segregation in its unions from the very beginning, and has been among the leaders in the fight to break down racial barriers in America. Many of the unions in the American Federation of Labor had been accustomed to discriminatory practices, but the situation in the A F of L has improved considerably since 1940. The Railroad Brotherhoods, by and large, have been slowest of all to change their practices, but there are signs of hope even among them.

One would suppose that the churches, with their teachings about the brotherhood of man, would be providing a great deal of leadership for making that brotherhood real among men. As in most spheres, however, the ideals of the churches have been considerably better than their practices. Segregation has been very widespread in the churches—in all honesty, it is still more prevalent in religious organizations than in most others. The churches have a great deal of house-cleaning to do before they can look at themselves with pride. They are well aware of this fact, and a number of interracial churches have begun to appear, in all parts of the country, including the South.

The recent progress in race relations in America is one of the few bright spots in a very discouraging world. Our optimism must not blind us to the injustices and inequities that continue to exist. There is still much to be done. In particular, none of the proposals in the President's Civil Rights Program has been enacted into law.

But a revolution in racial patterns is sweeping American society. An old Negro spiritual ends with the happy phrase, "And the walls came tumblin' down." The racial barriers that have divided this country for so long are tumbling down, and America is on the march toward more democratic racial practices. It is none too soon, for the whole world is watching us as we march.—L. P.

Editorial Notes

"IS not the meaning of the election," asks a thoughtful correspondent, "that we exchange a policy of alleged coddling of Communists at home and fighting Communism abroad, for one which coddles Communism abroad and fights it at home?" Taking the senatorial contest in California between Representatives Nixon and Douglas as typical, that

would seem to be an accurate description. For Representative Nixon ran on his record as a member of the Un-American Activities Committee, and Mrs. Douglas on her record of support for all measures designed to contain Communism. Taking the campaign as a whole the description of the results may be too neat. The *New York Times* reports that in Europe it is feared that the results of the election mean that Secretary Acheson's insistence that Europe is the strategic center of the fight against Communism will be subordinated to a strategy which will make Asia the center. Another correspondent thinks that the reversal in policy indicated by the election is that we will be less inclined to solve the Asiatic issue by political means, and will be more intent to resist Communism in Asia in military terms. In any case the stalemate in Congress in a period of great international crisis may well subject the nation to the greatest peril since 1860, as Joseph Alsop suggests.

In several close contests in the recent election in which "McCarthyism" was the issue, it was victorious, most notably in the defeat of Senator Tydings in Maryland. It is also fairly apparent that the support of the Catholic Church for Senator McCarthy's position weighed heavily in these contests. We do not want to add to the Protestant preoccupation with the "Catholic peril"; but it is worth pointing out to our Catholic friends that Catholic intervention in politics appears in quite different light from the outside than the inside. Catholic theory assumes that the church is interested only in preserving Christian standards of justice and freedom in our common life. Actually religious institutions frequently intervene in politics primarily in the interest of preserving or extending some institutional privilege; or for the purpose of favoring politicians, assumed to be more subservient to them than to other religious groups; or to register some special preoccupation which may actually be detrimental to the common welfare. The preoccupation in Catholic circles, both clerical and lay, with the dangers of Communist conspiracy in our own land has, we are sorry to say, aggravated the hysteria from which this nation suffers and which makes it difficult to deal soberly and wisely with the immense peril which confronts our nation.

It is well to remind the church, both Catholic and Protestant, that it is not inevitably the "leaven" which leavens the lump of civil society. If it is too sure of itself in that vocation it may, while preaching to others, itself become a cast away.—R. N.

Is It "Christian Economics"?

ROBERT McAFEE BROWN

THE Christian Freedom Foundation, Inc., has recently increased its fortnightly journal, *Christian Economics*, to four pages of generous size. Except for its apparently wide circulation and the masthead of its directors, one could write it off as just another reactionary news sheet. And yet, although its viewpoint gives it a spiritual kinship with Spiritual Mobilization, it cannot be disregarded as just another fly-by-night editorial venture. Its editor, Howard Kershner, is a distinguished Quaker, whose relief work in Europe has won him the respect of all Christians, whatever their or his economic leanings may be. The board of directors includes such men as Samuel Shoemaker, Robbins Barstow, Russell Clinchy, and others who are men of stature. The inclusion of the name of Norman Vincent Peale gives an immediate clue to the viewpoint of *Christian Economics*, though it would be disturbing if a similar conclusion were to be drawn simply because pastors of eleven (large) Presbyterian churches are included among the directors. But when a paper dedicates itself to the task of elucidating Christian economics in our complex world, it is important to see quite clearly just what lies behind the claim to be able to do this.

* * * * *

The paper is dedicated to the proposition that "freedom and Christianity are interdependent" (Sep. 26, p. 1). Everything of course hinges on what is meant by these two words. It is quite clear what is meant by the former: "Freedom in the market is the most efficient and mutually helpful system" (ibid). Freedom is laissez-faire freedom, unashamedly so: "Any artificial interference with the free price system is in reality interference with the best satisfaction of human wants" (Sep. 26, p. 4). Where the paper stands with regard to economics is perfectly plain. The hand of the ghostwriter is everywhere in evidence. The ghostwriter's name is Adam Smith.

It is economics, all right, of a plainly recognizable kind, but the question must be asked, "Is it Christian?" To determine what the editors mean by Christianity is much harder than to determine what they mean by economics. But after examining several issues of this paper, one is forced to the conclusion that "Christianity" is interpreted to be that which gives a religious bolstering or spiritual sanction to the type of economics favored by the editors. Capitalism is the true outworking of the Christian religion; any economic system which is not capitalist is pagan or godless. The newspaper, then, represents a frank and unashamed wedding of the Christian faith and laissez-faire capitalism. It will be instructive to look at the efforts of the high priests to

suggest that the union has not only been blessed but consummated.

The assumptions running through almost every page might be reduced to the following:

1. Godless Communism is the major threat to civilization.
2. Socialism is a halfway house on the way to Communism; Britain has reached that point and America is not far behind.
3. Therefore, only a return to free enterprise, which obviously has God's sanction, will save America and/or civilization.

There are various corollaries of this position which deserve examination. They reveal a fundamental confusion concerning the basic issues involved. Consider, for example, the charge that *the threat of Communism resides in its godlessness*. There is no doubt that this is the cause of the editors' fears. Reference is made to its "well known anti-God philosophy" (Sep. 12, p. 1), and to the "Kremlin gangsters," who have a "pagan anti-God philosophy of materialism" (Oct. 10, p. 2; cf also Sep. 26, p. 2). Marxism is abhorred because it is atheistic. But is this not profoundly to miss the point? Is not the real power of Communism derived precisely from the fact that it involves such total commitment, such a complete act of what can be called religious faith, on the part of its adherents? The communist is dangerous not because he is so wicked, but because he is so committed. He is not irreligious, but profoundly religious. He has a faith in a total worldview which puts the Christian to shame. If Communism is not seen in this dimension, surely the ways of coping with it are going to be rather hysterical and inadequate.

But *Christian Economics* views the matter like this: Communism is a godless economics, therefore we must combat it with a God-centered economics, the economics of laissez-faire. The communists are the bad, anti-God people; the capitalists are the good, pro-God people. The identification of capitalist economics with virtue, and any other economics with vice is quite unambiguous:

The intellectually honest advocates of the total state (of which there are but few) cannot visualize an efficient society in which free men cooperate without compulsion. . . . Their error probably stems from their ignorance of and denial of God, without Whom a free society could not long exist (Sep. 26, p. 4).

There is no realization of the fact that it might have been modern capitalism's tremendous exploitation of

large groups of peoples, the disparities it produced between the "haves" and the "have nots," which has driven millions, particularly in the Eastern world, into the arms of the communists, not to mention the socialists. On the contrary, those who are not capitalists are probably dishonest or ignorant or both.

Another highly doubtful assertion which is uncritically accepted as axiomatic insinuates itself into the above type of argument. This is the proposition that *anything which is not capitalistic is communistic*. This dogma is most clearly seen in the constant identification of Socialism and Communism. "Our Socialist friends," for example, "... say it is necessary for *one* man to direct all our economic activities" (Sep. 12, p. 1, *italics mine*). Socialism is the same as totalitarianism; there is no distinction. On the same page as this statement, another statement is quoted with approval, to the effect that "there is no place in our midst for communists, fellow travelers and other cranks," the latter being defined as those "who by wild accusations and empty promises would lead us down the trail to political and economic slavery" (Sep. 12, p. 1). Thus all who do not worship at the throne of laissez-faire are branded and lumped together as equally undesirable. Then there is reference to a typical "Communist and Socialist cliché" (Sep. 12, p. 2), taking it for granted that both groups always say precisely the same thing. It is asserted that "there is little personal responsibility under *any* form of collectivism" (Sep. 26, p. 2, *italics mine*), implying that every alternative to laissez-faire is equally abhorrent. But one of the most blatant of these identifications occurs in the context of a discussion of Great Britain, the "Socialistic Hand-Out State," in which the writer makes the following remarkable statement:

The planners can brook no interference from any source—press, radio, school, home or church. So one can readily see from the planners' point of view, the imperative necessity of the terrorized silence, the censored press and radio, the government dominated school and church, that characterize the evolution of the Socialist Hand-Out State into full-fledged dictatorship (Oct. 10, p. 3).

To suggest not only by inference, but by direct context, that this is an accurate description of Britain is sheer nonsense, as well as being highly untrue.

This lumping together of all shades and degrees of "collectivists" and intimating that they are "communists," is reinforced by the editorial policy of pointing the finger of suspicion on all in this country who are not uncritical admirers of everything for which the National Association of Manufacturers stands. It is assumed that there is a black and white distinction between the "planners" and the "non-planners"; instead of realizing that the true choice today is between degrees and types of planning. So

there is the familiar allegation that our present State Department is riddled with "pinks" (Sep. 12, p. 2), and that it follows "the party line" as advocated by its pinko (*sic*) advisors" (*ibid*). Our officials are "duped by the wiles of Joe Stalin," with whom they have drunk and chummed (Oct. 10, p. 1). Such dangerous tendencies as Social Security are roundly criticized (Sep. 12, p. 1); and the public is being sold a false bill of goods by this fraudulent scheme. And when Mr. Justice Douglas suggests that Iran should work out its own destiny, not necessarily adopting American business practices in toto, *Christian Economics* headlines this announcement with the words "Supreme Court Justice Recommends Communism" (Sep. 26, p. 1). Now this sort of hysteria is to be expected from men of the stature of Senator McCarthy, and one can recognize it in them for what it is. But to have this sort of thing baptized into the Christian faith, not only justified but sanctified, is indeed a disturbing and disheartening sign.

* * * * *

We must now turn to a fundamental ambivalence of attitude on the part of the writers of *Christian Economics*. Here a real confusion becomes apparent. On one level of thought, for example, the editors cannot make up their minds whether they are for, or against, what they call, in good Biblical terminology, Mammon. In one column, Mammon is the real enemy (Oct. 10, p. 4), and Christians are advised to turn from faith in Mammon to faith in God. And yet on the same page of the same issue, the American Way of Life is vigorously championed because it produces 40% of the world's wealth or Mammon, including 92% of the world's bathtubs (Oct. 10, p. 4). We are, apparently, to adopt a religion which says "no" to the things of this world, while adopting at the same time an economics which says "yes" to the things of this world.

A variant of this ambivalence is encountered in *Christian Economics'* advice on how to meet these times. The way to solve our social problems is to cut out all controls and rely on Christian virtues and "individual integrity" (Sep. 12, p. 1). A strong plea is made to Christians to curb self-interest. Only in this way, the paper editorializes, can we keep our heads above water in the present swirling maelstrom. And yet, it is apparently only by a stronger and stronger appeal to self-interest, that we can continue to reap the economic benefits which have made our land great, for,

If we fail to reward the man who denies himself the pleasure of present consumption, in order to save for the accumulation of capital (tools, machinery and equipment), we shall stop progress. Men will not save without hope of reward (Sep. 12, p. 2).

"To save ourselves, we must transcend self-interest," is the gospel according to page 1. "To save our-

selves, we must encourage self-interest," is the gospel according to page 2. Surely this is carrying too far the injunction not to let thy first page know what thy second page containeth.

The same problem has roots yet deeper in the doctrine of man adopted by the writers of *Christian Economics*. The source of good in man is the spiritual, the source of evil is the physical. Man is physical, but he has marvelous spiritual potential; and it is in the latter realm that his highest possibilities lie (Oct. 10, p. 2). The way to overcome war, for example, is for man to stretch up above the physical plane to the spiritual realm. "Nothing but the transference of the loyalties of man from the physical to the spiritual plane of existence will eradicate war" (ibid). This makes Russia a convenient whipping-boy because of its "materialism." One is inclined to ask where this "Christian" interpretation of a two-story man came from. Certainly not from the Bible. If there is anything on which Christianity insists, it is on the unity of man, and on the fact that his sin is not the drag of the physical self on the spiritual self, but the corruption of the whole self. On this score, *Christian Economics* appears to be infected not only with bad economics, but with bad theology. Nor can it fail to be apparent that it is curious logic for a paper to advocate at one and the same time a religion which draws us more and more away from the "physical plane," and an economic system which is constantly commended precisely because it ministers so effectively to the physical plane. Remember those bathtubs.

* * * * *

There are at least three more assumptions of *Christian Economics* to which attention must be called. The first of these is the assumption that *the way to social reform is through individual conversion*. Social conscience is held to depend almost exclusively on personal conscience. Consequently, social justice is not to be achieved by responsible governmental action, but by relying

on the process of Christian education gradually to raise our individual citizens to a spiritual plane where they will recognize their social stewardship and voluntarily cooperate in bringing about those improvements in the social order that we are all so eager to see achieved (Oct. 10, p. 3).

In our world today, then, such things as unemployment and lack of food need not worry the Christian; nothing need be done to organize society to combat them effectively, since Christians will look out for one another. An individualist approach to these problems is all that is needed; the Christian "does not need to fear temporary suffering because he knows that among Christian neighbors there is always Christian charity" (Sep. 26, p. 4). Create good individuals, and this will solve collective problems. Now if this is a truth, it is only a half-truth.

Of course we must try to make individuals more Christian, but this alone is not enough; we must also try to achieve on the level of collective justice what cannot be established on the level of individual love. To refuse the second half of the truth is simply to consign generation after generation to the dubious prospect of insecurity, injustice, and the handout. The fight for social justice must be waged on two fronts at once, for it cannot be assumed that piety and political wisdom will go hand in hand. As P. T. Forsyth put it, "One of the greatest moral dangers is a truly pious man with a conventional morality in the midst of a great crisis."

A second further assumption, which is not a hidden assumption at all, is that *religion brings material reward*. This is a dominant theme of the editorial page. If you want to be successful, be religious; you'll get ahead faster that way; God smiles on the capitalist and rewards him. Two examples:

Serving God was the first order of business, the most important thing in the lives of our Pilgrim Fathers. More than any other factor this accounts for the success and prosperity of our country during the Colonial period and the first century of our national existence.

As we have grown away from this ideal, difficulties have come upon us. . . . (Sep. 12, p. 2).

This leads to the further proposition that if we have a revival of sincere religion, we can expect material blessings to follow as a matter of course. Our economic status will improve when, for example, we take Sabbath observance more seriously:

The editor spent a part of his boyhood on a small fruit farm in southern Missouri. It was believed necessary to pick the berries every day of the week, but Father and Mother believed in keeping the Sabbath Day and refused to do so. Although our neighbors all assured us that the fruit would spoil, experience proved them wrong. When an impartial and honest man was required to have charge of marketing for the community, the choice fell upon Father, whose integrity was never questioned (Oct. 10, p. 2, lead editorial).

Now one obviously has no quarrel with Sabbath observance, but to commend this practice because of the material benefit which may be expected to entail, is a questionable gospel, to say the least; just as it is highly questionable to equate virtue and success.

A final assumption, perhaps in the long run the most dangerous, is the belief that *the survival of the church depends upon the survival of capitalism*. The church must spring to the defense of capitalism because it is capitalism which makes it possible for the church to exist; the church has the biggest stake in the survival of capitalism and the defeat of the "Hand-Out State." "The Church should be in this fight right up to the hilt. For no institution has more at stake" (Oct. 10, p. 3). This, as is well

known, is also the position of Norman Vincent Peale, who states it at length in the September 26 issue. (Unlimited numbers of free copies of his message "Let the Church Speak Up for Capitalism," are available from *Christian Economics*, in case you missed the same article in the *Reader's Digest*.) Now such a position, if really followed, must mean the death of the church. If the church cannot stand in judgment over all political systems, rather than being dependent on any one of them, the church had better close up shop, or at least give up any pretense to be preaching a prophetic Gospel. If there are areas of life upon which the searching and judging and renewing light of the Christian faith may not be thrown, then it is time to stop pretending that the Gospel is anything more than a sort of pious cloak for particular economic pressure groups. In the face of this attempt to curtail the voice of the church one can only align himself with what *Christian Economics* calls the "muddy thinking" of John Bennett (Oct. 10, p. 3) when he points out that the church is not dependent upon the survival of capitalism. Our gospel is relevant to all ages and all men. It was not ushered onto the stage of history only with the advent of capitalism, and it will continue to exercise its prophetic role long after capitalism, as we have known it, has disappeared.

* * * * *

It is all right for a group of men to stand for a certain economic position. But it is quite another thing to assume on every page, and to argue on every other page, that there is an unambiguous identification between the Christian faith and that economic position. Waiving the fundamental question of whether or not there is such a thing as "Christian economics," any more than there is "Christian mathematics" or "Christian biology," one must surely protest most vigorously against this uncritical alliance of the Christian faith with a type of economic and political analysis which is open to question not only on the ultimate religious level, but also on the level of social, economic and political understanding and criticism.

The type of propaganda which *Christian Economics* is giving its readers makes it more and more imperative that those Christians who refuse to follow such right-wing policies should speak with clarity and power about the way in which the Christian can live his life in the complex world of today without either selling his soul or giving up the struggle.

Authors in This Issue

Robert McAfee Brown is an instructor in Systematic Theology at Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Richard M. Fagley is co-secretary of the Department of International Justice and Goodwill of The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

The Churches and the Peace Patrol

RICHARD M. FAGLEY

THE role of the churches in the proposal for a U.N. Peace Observation Commission, a major feature of the seven-nation "United Action for Peace" resolution which is the central business of this year's General Assembly, is a story which needs to be told. This proposal of churchmen constitutes what one secular leader has described as "about the most constructive idea anybody has put forward this summer." While not descriptive of the main function of the churches in the field of world order, the proposal nevertheless illustrates the kind of practical and pertinent leadership which church agencies can exercise in these days of decision.

The story begins in Toronto in early July, where the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs and the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches discussed issues raised by the fighting in Korea. In both discussions, major importance was attached to first-hand reports on the North Korean aggression from the U. N. Commission on the scene, which included a representative of India. It was on the basis of reports from this Commission, the "most objective witness available," that the Central Committee of the World Council commended the United Nations for "its prompt decision to meet this aggression and for authorizing a police measure which every member nation should support."

Reflecting on the Toronto discussions, Dr. O. Frederick Nolde, director of the C.C.I.A., was impressed by the fortunate presence in Korea of a U.N. Commission able to report the breach of the peace, and thus help to crystallize world opinion as to the facts. He came to the conclusion that the cause of peace would be served if the United Nations provided a system of observer commissions for other areas of international tension.

Dr. Nolde consulted with commissioners of the C.C.I.A. immediately available, and by mail with officers of the Commission overseas. Officers of the two parent bodies, the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council, were also consulted. The initial response proving favorable, a communication was sent on August 3 to a selected group of church leaders in 33 countries by officers of the C.C.I.A., Kenneth G. Grubb of London, and Dr. Nolde. The text of the letter was also made public and received considerable attention in press reports.

The letter urged a U.N. system of International Observer Commissions to provide widely representative teams of observers for areas of special international responsibility, as Germany, Austria, and Japan, and for service "upon the request of any gov-

ernment which fears aggression of any kind." By a comprehensive system, objectively conceived and operated, the letter stated, the U.N. would:

- (1) call upon all Member Governments to cooperate in this measure at a time when international peace and security are dangerously threatened;
- (2) make the extent of cooperation by Member Governments a test of their non-aggressive disposition and of their readiness to bring their conduct under international scrutiny;
- (3) serve as a deterrent to aggression, on the assumption that governments will not want to risk the stigma of being named the aggressor by an impartial agent;
- (4) facilitate objective identification of the aggressor in the event that aggression is perpetrated.

The C.C.I.A. officers suggested that national church commissions give serious and prompt consideration to the proposal, and that, if agreement were reached, representation made to government "may serve to encourage support for such a proposal at the forthcoming session of the U.N. General Assembly."

Even before the publication of this letter, Commissioners of the C.C.I.A. who found merit in the proposal were active in bringing the idea to the attention of high government authorities. Mr. Dulles, a member of the Commission, for example, discussed the proposal with other officers of the Department of State, and the basic idea was incorporated in U.S. policy. Churchmen in several other countries made representations to the foreign office or U.N. delegation of their respective governments. Supporting action by interdenominational and denominational bodies has already been reported from Australia, New Zealand, Great Britain, and the United States. Secular organizations dedicated to the ideals of the United Nations have also supported the proposal. At Lake Success, the fundamental proposition has had a resounding success.

As presented to the General Assembly by Mr. Dulles, on behalf of the United States, the proposed Peace Observation Commission, acting perhaps through regional sub-commissions, "would go, or send field observers, to points of tension as indicated by the Assembly or the Interim Committee with, of course, the consent of the country concerned." Mr. Dulles went on to say of these observers:

"They would be the eyes and ears of the United Nations. Their very presence would make aggression less likely. . . . If, despite the risk of exposure, aggression did occur, . . . then the Observation Commission could supply prompt and reliable information to serve as a basis for action or recommendation."

While the United States did not favor the inclusion of the so-called "great" powers in the membership of the Commission, this position has since been modified in the interest of unanimous approval of at least this part of the "United Action for Peace" resolution.

The heartening story of effective church impact upon the United Nations shows how even in a relatively technical field church agencies like the C.C.I.A. can exercise leadership. It shows the importance of participation in such groups by qualified laymen like Mr. Dulles, Norman Makin of Australia, Charles Malik of Lebanon, men who can gauge the practical consequences of concrete recommendations and who have a voice in the shaping of governmental policies. It shows the value of a sustained and systematic approach to international affairs by an international group of churchmen, who can move quickly to evoke a simultaneous response from Christian groups around the world. The story of the U.N. "peace patrol" ought to encourage those in the Christian fellowship who covet for the churches a more vigorous initiative on every social front.

The World Church: News and Notes

Barth Supports Niemöller

Professor Karl Barth has proclaimed his opposition to the rearmament of Germany. His statement, made in answer to a query from the editor of the Berlin *Unterwegs*, places him on the side of Pastors Niemöller and Heinemann in the growing division among European churchmen over the rearmament question.

Asked about a possible *Kirchenkampf* over rearmament within the Evangelical Church of Germany, Professor Barth replied that "the good and necessary confession" of his friends "in the relation of Christian communion and civil community would have to be admitted," and "if they are sure in their conscience before God," they should "stand fast whatever betide."

Supporting his stand against rearmament, Professor Barth pointed out that as far as Germany was concerned, any war between East and West would "of necessity have the character of a civil war, a struggle of German against German."

Barth further expressed the opinion that militarization of Western Germany would constitute "a direct challenge to the Soviet Union" and might be "the spark in the powder magazine."

Barth recommended, as the alternative to rearmament "the positive defense against Communism" through refugee work, repatriation of prisoners of war, provision for the unemployed, to prevent Europe's social situation from finally attracting Communism "in

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

M. SEARLE BATES	F. ERNEST JOHNSON
JOHN C. BENNETT	LISTON POPE
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
GLOSTER MORRIS, <i>Secretary</i>	

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER	HENRY SMITH LEIPER
CHARLES W. GILKEY	JOHN A. MACKAY
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
UMPHREY LEE	FRANCIS P. MILLER
	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HOWARD CHANDLER ROBBINS	

spite of all the present distaste for it, as damp attracts mushrooms."

This "immeasurably greater task" was urged by the Swiss theologian especially as Europeans would "much rather never see the German soldier reappear."—*Ecumenical Press Service*, Geneva.

Catholic Priest in Poland on "Peace"

The pressure of the communist government in Poland upon the Catholic Church is revealed by an appeal of 73 Polish Catholic priests, who attended the Polish Peace Congress in Warsaw in September, to the Catholic priests of the world. Their appeal follows the communist propaganda line for line. It declares:

We the Catholic priests of Poland, elected and delegated by Catholics in our country to attend the First Polish Peace Congress in Warsaw, in our profound concern for the peace of the world, are hereby appealing to your hearts and your minds. . . . A handful of the mighty of the world, possessed by Satanic greed, strive,

Periodical Division
Detroit Public Library
5201 Woodward Avenue
Detroit 2, Michigan

650 1-51

through bloodshed, through fire and through the suffering of the nations of this globe, to satisfy their vain-glorious pride and their lust for power and riches. They are piling up arms so that by the mass annihilation of innocent people, of children, women and of the aged, they may attain their criminal aims.

What is the mass bombardment of peaceful Korean cities and villages from the air and from the sea, but a terrible violation of God's commandments, what but a crime against humanity? What is the mad armaments race and the attempt to restore an army of hitlerite murderers, well tried in the crime of genocide, but an ominous repetition of the steps that lead to fascism? . . .

Upon entering into the memorable agreement with the Government of the People's Poland on April 14, 1950, the Catholic Bishops of our beloved country wrote: "In accordance with the teachings of the Church, the Episcopate shall support all efforts aimed at a strengthening of peace and oppose, to the extent of its ability, all attempts at provoking war." Guided by this directive, we have taken our stand, along with the people of our country, on the side of the most ardent partisans and defenders of peace, so that through the word of God, through our deeds and the light of our teaching we may bar the road to aggression.

We call upon you Brother Priests, to take your stand at the head of the faithful entrusted to your care. We call upon you that you redouble your efforts for the preservation of peace. Let all the Catholics of the world join with us in the demand for a ban on aggression and violence against free nations. . . .

Dr. Hromádka on American Aggression in Korea

The Czechoslovak Communist daily *Prace* of October 31, 1950, published the following story: "Professor Dr. J. L. Hromádka, theologian of world reputation, known in the church quarters of the entire West who during the occupation (of Czechoslovakia by Nazis) was active as teacher at an American university, wrote to the chairman of the Security Council the following letter:

"The increasing sad news on the American aggression in Korea and Formosa did not stir only me personally, but also many of my friends. From the time of my long activities as teacher in the U.S.A. I was in close contact with former students from the Far East and with deep interest I was following the growing movement of the nations in Asia for complete independence and self-determination. I cannot understand the fact that the Security Council submitted to the American request for 'police action' against Northern Korea with all the raids and destroying of the lives of civilian population. As a faithful Christian I see terrible consequences of this fatal decision. I am deeply solicitous when I consider the means which allegedly protect the Christian civilization, and I decidedly protest against the stubbornness with which the Security Council under the guidance of the representatives of the U.S.A. opposes all efforts for peace solution of the Korean crisis."

(This report must be received with some reserve as the Communist press announced a year ago that Dr. Hromádka would represent Czechoslovakia at the Waldorf-Astoria "peace congress" whereas he had refused to do so.)